

THE SHIP ABOLITION.

A poetical description of Mr. Drew's splendid painting, in which the anti-slavery enterprise is presented under the figure of a ship, full rigged, urging her way against opposition, towards the port of Liberty. Upon her masts, which are dipping in the breeze, are inscribed appropriate mottoes. In the back ground, the Colonization Enterprise is represented under the figure of a ship stranded upon a reef. Heavy black clouds, charged with the elements of destruction, are seen lowering around her,—her masts are cut away,—her sails are shivered by the tempest,—and her freight and crew are left to the mercy of the waves. A boat, sent from the ship Abolition to the relief of the perishing crew, is seen returning, filled with those whom it has rescued from impending death.

I.

Standing on Freedom's peaceful strand,
I saw a ship approach the land;
I hailed it! 'What name? in what condition?'
'All's well,' they cried,—'Ship Abolition!'
I paused and gazed, as nearer drew
The noble ship with gallant crew—
And saw her, with her sails spread wide,
Urging her way 'gainst wind and tide (1).

Her masts floated high in air,—
I saw these mottoes written there:
'The world's my country—all mankind
My countrymen,—for all have mind.'
'Break every yoke, and let go free
The oppress'd who sigh for liberty;
'What you'd have others do to you,
Be sure to them you always do.'

I soon could hear the captain's voice,
Bidding his gallant crew rejoice:
'He who has kept in calm and storm,
He said, with all his world perform.'

I ask'd the noble captain's name?
His destination?—whence he came?
He said, 'my name's *Philanthropy*—(2)
I'm from the land of the *boasted free*.'

I left that land, because in chains
They bind the men within whose veins
They draw a drop of *Africa's blood*—
And say he's not a child of God.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

II.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

My heart grew sick at sin so foul,—
Against it all my powers of soul
Indignant rose,—and bade me flee
To seek a land where all are free.

Across a dark and troubled sea,
A *Dome* (17)—inscribed to *Liberty*.

There congregated *Freedom's host*:—
To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
They gave the noble *Dome* in prayer,
And sought their country's blessing there.

Blush, as the painful truth I tell—
While thus engaged, a *skiffish yell*
Was heard without,—it rent the air,—
The hosts of darkness murmur'd there.

The evening torch soon burn'd and blazed;
The cry of 'fire the house' was raised;
And though entranced in God's name,
The building soon was wrapt in flame.

Thus God our faith and patience tried;
But we in Him did still confide;
And as we prayed, 'Lord, do thy will,'
He said, 'Go on, I'm with you still.'

VI.

The wind now blew a fresher breeze;
We hasten'd onward o'er the seas,
Propelled by scenes we'd lately past,
Towards where we hoped to moor at last.

Now was found our ship would go,
Whichever (18) way the wind might blow—
So Congress thought it best to chain
The winds,—nor let them blow again.

To prosecute a work so great
Was form'd a grand *trinitarian* (19),
Who sought to make the breezes lag,
By 'plying to the winds a gag.'

When it was found the winds were free,
And would be, 'spite of man's decree,
Then southern tyrants raved and foam'd (20)
And slavery, in torture, roam'd.

The wind now blew a hurricane;
With double speed our vessel came,
And all on board sung joyfully:
'The Lord doth give the victory.'

Our watch-words 'On!' 'what'er betide,
We've vowed that we will all abide
Within the ship, till storms are o'er,
And men in bonds shall sigh no more (21).

VII.

I next the noble captain asked,
What vessels in his course he'd passed:
He said, 'we've lately sped a *wreck* (22)
With signals hoisted on her deck.'

We mann'd our boats, and sent relief:
We found her stranded on a reef (23)—
Her masts were cut—her sails were torn—
And her last hope of rescue gone.

Her freight was floating round about her,
Non-um and *Dupont's* best gunpowder (24):
Her men were in a dreadful plight—
Battling the waves with all their might.

With joy they hailed the little band,
Sent to extend a friendly hand,
Them from impending death, to save
Their bodies from a watery grave.

The boat was fill'd, and soon returned,
And hope in every bosom burn'd—
That all, henceforth, would be secure,
Our bark the coming storms endure.

We swiftly glided on our way,
Cheer'd by the blessings of the day:
And gathering round a pleasant fire,
Of those we'd saved did thus inquire:

What was your puny (25) vessel's name?
And what the land whence you came?
Who your commander?—whither bound,
When on the reef you went around?

One rose and said, 'our vessel's name,
(Given by the nation whence we came),
If you, kind friends, desire to know,
Was rightly call'd 'The black man's foe' (26).

Our captain bled Ethiopia's race,
His name was 'Mr. Prejudice' (27):
We came from the great mart (28) of slaves—
Bound to a land (29) beyond the waves.

A north-east (30) storm around us lower'd,
The captain and his crew all cower'd,
And gave the ship up to the seas—
To go where winds and waves might please.

The cry soon rose above the storm,
'The ship has struck! all hope is gone
Of seeing friends, or native land!—
Just then the cry, 'help, help, at hand!'

Our hearts leaped up, and filled with hope;
The gloomy spell of death was broke:
We raised our eyes—'help, help,' we cried,
You took us in—our wants supplied.

May Heaven protect your ship and crew,
And guide you all your voyage through:
Be truth and right your firm position,
God speed the good ship *Abolition* (31).

THETA.

Boston, April 30, 1839.

(17) The object of Pennsylvania Hall was to furnish a place where the friends of humanity and of God might meet, and freely discuss great moral subjects, and enlighten the nation upon the subject of the evils which threatened its destruction, and to arouse her to action for the removal of those evils, by repentance and reformation, that her ruin might be averted. It was designed to be to the American Republic, in a moral sense, what the light-house is to the mariner in a natural.

(18) The efforts of friends and the opposition of enemies combined, have constituted a mighty propelling power to urge onward the car of universal freedom.

(19) Pinckney, of S. C., Patton of Va., and Atherton of N. H., each of whom was the author of a set of resolutions designed to give free discussion.

(20) Slaveholders know that free discussion is working the death of their peculiar institution; and hence, when they perceive that they cannot prevent it by any thing which they can do, they rave and foam to think that slavery must die in spite of its friends.

(21) Remember them that are in bonds as bound with them.

(22) Pieces of the wreck have been seen in different parts of the N. E. States, where Messrs. Gurley and Cresson have presented the claims of the A. C. S., and could get hardly enough together (if we except the abolitionists,) to say 'we!'

(23) Worldly expediency.

(24) (Rev.) C. M. Waring and F. Taylor offer for sale the cargo of the schooner, from Liverpool, 500 kegs powder, 500 muskets, 150 cutlasses, 10 bags shot, 10 puncheons rum, 2 do. brandy, 6 cases East India Madeira wine, 20 casks pale ale, 10 do. brown stout, &c.—*Liberator's Herald*, March 22, 1832.

(25) As an evidence that the colonization enterprise has been but a pious concern, take the following fact: In 17 years it removed from this country to Africa a number of the colored population only equivalent to its increase in 5 1-2 days.

(26) The colonization scheme has been one of the greatest curses to the colored population, both bond and free.

(27) The colonization enterprise had its origin in, and has been perpetuated by prejudice against color.

(28) U. S. of America.

(29) Africa.

(30) Colonization has been most strongly opposed in the N. E. States.

(31) This is the language now held by those who have been taken from the wreck of Colonization, on board the good ship *Abolition*.

THE LIBERATOR.

NON-RESISTANCE.

INFIDELITY—JACOBINISM—NO-GOVERNMENT.

Vincit Omnia Veritas.

[CONCLUDED FROM LAST WEEK.]

If, then, all government originates with the people; if the magistrate, according to the common theory, receives his penal power from the people, and is to exercise it only in obedience to their will; and if any number of individuals, united and moving together, and calling themselves a state, a nation, a commonwealth, or a republic, may not do any thing which it had been a sin for any individual member of the state to have done before he united with the state; then it follows, that a magistrate or a government cannot of right do any thing which the individuals who established it might not do in their private capacity. The fact that men move in masses, as states, or nations, or kingdoms, cannot alter, increase or diminish individual moral obligations. 'An action does not acquire any new qualities by being the desire of one thousand persons rather than of one. There may be more danger, indeed, in disobeying one thousand, than in disobeying one, but not more guilt.'—*Brown's Philosophy of the Mind*.

An individual sin cannot, by being the act of millions, become a national virtue. What is theft, robbery, murder, or piracy, when done by an individual, is in his private capacity; cannot be manufactured into moral excellence by being perpetrated by fifteen millions calling themselves a nation, or a republic. What is villainy and infamy in one man, acting alone, in his private capacity, cannot be moral greatness and glory in millions, acting as a state or kingdom.

Nor can individuals, of right, authorize a magistrate to do that for them which they may not do for themselves.

'The supreme power, being out the joint power of every member of the society, can be no more than those persons had in a state of nature, before they entered into society and gave it up to the community. For no body can transfer to another more power than he has in himself. No body can give more power than he has himself; and he that cannot take away his own life, cannot give another power over it. No man can, by agreement, pass over to another that which he hath not in himself; a power over his own life.'—*Locke*.

'The power of society over the individual, is derived from the concessions of every individual.'—*Wayland's Moral Science*.

This is the doctrine, implied or expressed, in all our State Constitutions and in the Declaration. The people who originate the government, and from whom all the penal power of the magistrate is derived, cannot authorize the government, which they originated, to do that to them which they had no right to do to themselves and to each other, before they formed the government; nor can they confer on the magistrate power to inflict on them penalties for crimes, which they had no right to inflict on themselves and each other, for similar crimes. If I may not make, sell or drink intoxicating liquor myself, I may not authorize another to do these things. If I may not return injury for injury to any one myself, I may not employ another, or join with 15,000,000 of men, to employ another to do it for me. I cannot transfer to another what I do not possess. This is plain common sense—a logical and a necessary inference from the prevalent theory respecting the origin of the penal power in human governments. Would you ascertain whether human governments have a moral right to exercise any penal power? Whether, rightfully, or not, they are invested with power to inflict physical suffering and death on evil-doers? Or whether they may punish, and what kind and extent of penalties they may inflict for each and every offence? Resolve society, or the state, into its original elements. Determine what each individual may do to and for himself, and what each individual may do to and for each and every other individual. Define the power which each has over his own body, and which each has over the body of each and every other. See what offences each one, acting as an individual, may punish, and what penalties he may inflict. Then may you know precisely what penal power the government has, and whether it has any. Must not we determine how individuals are to treat evil-doers by the spirit, precepts and example of Jesus Christ?

But Joseph Tracy says:—This doctrine concerning the origin of civil authority—of the right of a nation to govern its individual members—is the very foundation doctrine of jacobinism; and that the name of jacobin, significant of all that is mean, brutal, ferocious, anarchical, bloody, murderous and atheistical, and rendered detestable and infamous by the heart-chilling, blood-freezing horrors of the French Revolution, belongs to all who hold to it.—i. e. to Locke, Blackstone, Franklin, Washington—to nineteen twentieths of the citizens and professed ministers and Christians of the U. S.; for these all believe that 'all government, of right, originates from the people, and that all power is derived from them.' If they deserve this, friend Tracy, put it on them. Spare them not. Cry aloud. Let not their standing, reputation, professions or titles shield them from merited rebuke.

But do the non-resistants embrace this doctrine? Do they believe that a government thus originated, thus principled, and thus administered, is a *Christian* government, entitled to be received as an approved minister of God? Far otherwise. By its fruits it is known. They say—'we cannot acknowledge allegiance' to such a government; that such a government 'cannot be approvingly ordained of God'; that all such governments, originating with men, endowed by them with what Blackstone calls—a 'supreme, irresistible, uncontrollable authority,' a discretionary penal power over the lives of men, are entirely contrary to the spirit and precepts of Jesus Christ. They hold that the sovereign power of men, whether considered as individuals, acting singly and alone, or as communities, states or nations, is solely in God—that our supreme Ruler, our Heavenly Father, never did lodge on earth in the hands of any individual, or of any number of individuals, called a state, nation or kingdom, a discretionary penal power, or 'a supreme, irresistible and uncontrollable authority' over man—that Christianity leaves the whole power of punishing in the hands of the King of kings, arrays Omnipotence against evil-doers, as the only power in the universe with which they must contend, and in its spirit and principles, 'to put down all (men-made) magistrates, princes and rulers'—to put all rulers, who derive their powers from men under his feet, as enemies to his cause, and 'to break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms of this world.' A state, or government, or magistrate, establishing us as an approved minister of God, to establish his authority and to bring us back to our allegiance to him, and beginning by requiring us to swear allegiance to itself, and threatening to inflict upon us fines, imprisonment, personal injuries and death, if we do not obey its behests, we cannot recognize as a Christian government. It has not the spirit of Christ; it returns evil for evil; it will not leave vengeance to God; it assumes an avenging power over men; thus invading the prerogative of the only true sovereign power of nations; and though it is never to be resisted or assailed by carnal weapons, it must and will be destroyed by those spiritual weapons which are mighty through God to demolish all that is high and strong, and to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

To that government, which recognizes no God as the only sovereign power to whom allegiance is due—which aims to establish only its dominion over this world—which practically leaves vengeance to man; overcomes evil with good—and which proclaims to the nation, to the world and the universe—

'The Lord is your Lawgiver, the Lord is your Judge, the Lord is your King, he will protect you,' I cordially acknowledge allegiance, call it by what name you please. It is the government which Christ came to establish over mankind, and which he will establish, and that on the ruins of all others.

Who then are jacobins? Not indeed the advocates of non-resistance, for they reject with strong abhorrence, the very doctrine which our opponents themselves say is the foundation doctrine of jacobinism. Mr. Tracy says—'God has made it the duty of every people to form a government—arrange a magistracy and enforce wholesome laws, as its necessities require.' Where has God made it the duty of man to form any other government than to submit,

heart and life, to his own government? 'To arrange' any other magistracy than to receive the Lord Almighty at their 'Lawgiver, Judge and King' Or to enforce any other laws by any other penalties than those laws, and by those penalties which are laid down in the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ? Such a spiritual government all men are bound to form—as individuals and nations, or rather to obey. Such a spiritual magistracy they are bound to arrange'—and such spiritual laws they are bound to enforce; not with prisons, swords, guns and cannon, but with those spiritual weapons with which Christ has furnished his champions in the fight of Faith, and with which, under his guidance, they will conquer this world. May we form any other government?—'arrange' any other magistracy, and 'enforce' any other laws? *Vincit Omnia Veritas*. Truth conquers all things. H. C. W.

From the Herald of Freedom.

ORANGE SCOTT.

Our editorial mind is not broad, but we give place in it again to our brave fellow soldier, though he is not augmenting his renown, we apprehend, as a clear and consistent writer. He seems to us to have been justified in his boldness, by some impulse or other, from his emotions towards brother Garrison's 'no human government' abstraction. And what government has brother Scott's ennobled eye, on that he should be not to say hypocritical, asking for what we have not the least expectation will ever be granted, and what we even think we do not need! What doctrine is this to go out to the world, that we have no expectation that any anti-slavery law will ever be passed by Congress? And if he does not get it, 'in the end of the world' we have enough already,—and yet are making the land great with our petitions, and are constantly complaining because they are not acted upon? If we have anti-slavery law enough now, we cannot say that in justice, they ought to be acted upon. A mode of 'moral agitation' this, from which I pray to be delivered. (16)

And now, my dear brother, I have done. I must say, that there are so many 'psalms' and 'tunes' being introduced by abolitionists, calculated to distract and divide, and that too by leaders in the cause, that we would be better to keep our eyes single on the enterprise! The man who first sounded the note of alarm, and first urged moral and political action, as a remedy for slavery, has it seems, and a new revelation, and one which has so purified his conscience that he cannot vote for the least unrighteous candidate; and one which is highly esteemed, has found out that we have anti-slavery law enough—and as much as we ever shall have. Are not these things encouraging? What will come next? Well, the battle is the Lord's! This is our comfort. (17)

If I have misunderstood you, I doubt not your willingness to explain, and also to defend your positions, or honorably retract them. This I hope ever to be willing to do.

With a sense of my inability to teach, but willingness to learn, I subscribe myself your well wisher and fellow-laborer in the cause of bleeding humanity. (18) April 18, 1839. O. SCOTT.

I am very glad you took my remarks so kindly; they were certainly intended.

You or your friend Garrison, with a rough hand, though probably my pen is a little untruly smooth. But as for the 'no human government theory' I will show it no mercy—give it no quarter; it being a 'monster of such frightful mien, that to be hated needs but to be seen.'

You say 'don't discuss that theory in the Herald at all.' This is right. I hope you never will.

But whether that is a sufficient reason for refusing to state definitely, whether you are opposed to this theory, or in favor of it, I doubt! I had you never introduced it into the Herald (2) it might be, perhaps, but this you have done several times, and have not spoken 'characteristically' on its merits or demerits; but have avoided committing yourself in a way which has given you the subject of discussion, and has been interfering with one of the sturdy sons of New-Hampshire, well known as an able correspondent of the Herald, a high-toned abolitionist, and with a firm friend of N. P. Rogers; and he says the readers of the Herald, so far as his knowledge and respect for you are concerned, are very much puzzled.

Now, if they are deceived, ought you not to undeceive them? (3) It was because you were *understood* to favor that theory, that I addressed you. I was sorry that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss the question, nor to admit any discussion of it into the columns of the Herald. (4) Far from this, we want to know whether we are right or wrong, or not. (5) You admit that the anti-slavery enterprise may be involved in the no human government notions. How then can you think it a matter of such small moment as you seem to do in another place? And have you not declared that the case should be so, and that you were in fact a Garrisonite, in this respect, I for one wished to know it. Openness and boldness is, you know, a characteristic of abolitionism; and especially of N. P. Rogers. Hence I was a little surprised after two or three articles of this kind, to see so much of this 'non-commitment, connected with a strong apparent leaning in a certain direction! Several anti-slavery editors have found it convenient to give their opinions definitely of this theory without discussing it at all, and we cannot wonder that we should be so much puzzled.

I must therefore respectfully invite you once more to give us your opinions of that theory, either *with or without reasons*. Remember I do not ask you to discuss